

E.1  
11/2/94

144720

**From:** THOMAS MARTIN  
**To:** R5WST.R5WASTE.BORRIES-SAMUEL, R5WST.R5WASTE.GORE-J...  
**Date:** Wednesday, November 2, 1994 11:54 pm  
**Subject:** Monsanto meeting

Monsanto is set to meet with us here in Chicago on Nov.21 at 10:00. I'll arrange for a conference room here at 200 W. Adams. I am assuming everyone is available given your response to my original LAN message. Site G will be the primary topic of the meeting but Monsanto is willing to "sit and listen" to us as to site Q. Monsanto apparently maintains it has nothing to do with the contamination on this site.

I think the notice letters for site G can go out after the meeting (theyre going to Monsanto and the property owners, including Cerro, correct?). We are not looking for action this Fall on this site. Also, if we sent the letters out, I would think we would want to invite the other noticed parties to the meeting as well. However, I do think it would be helpful for the 104 (e) for site Q to go out prior to the meeting. Jeff, what is your opinion?

**CC:** R5AIR.R5ORA.PASTOR-SUSAN, R5WST.R5WASTE.ALTUR-ALAN...

**From:** THOMAS MARTIN  
**To:** R5WST.R5WASTE.GORE-JEFFREY, R5WST.R5WASTE.BORRIES-...  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 26, 1994 1:05 pm  
**Subject:** Saugnet Area 1, Site Q

In St. Louis on 10/21, Paul Takacs (IEPA) and I reviewed the rest of the documents produced by Monsanto in response to our Section 104(e) Request and afterwards had a meeting with Monsanto atty Krchma and Environmental Staff Light and Stecker regarding the sites G and Q removals. I had previously sent Krchma the Site G Action memo, and gave him the Site Q memo upon arrival that morning. At our meeting, Krmcha showed an unfamiliarity with Site Q and asked some basic background questions. We told him the basic goals of the removal and the anticipated timing (work to be completed this fall) and gave him Diedre's name as the attorney lead. With regard to Site G, they didnt seem to have a problem with the actions called for in the memo, or the timing, but expressed a desire to get the details from Jeff and Sam. Paul suggested a meeting in Mid November to coincide with Sam's already scheduled visit to the St. Louis area.

With regard to Monsanto undertaking the work as a PRP lead, Krchma again expressed the position that Monsanto does not want to conduct the work in the absence of other PRPs. I stated that we were working to identify other (viable) parties, but there were no guarantees. Nevertheless, Monsanto expressed a strong desire to consult and be involved in the implementation of the site G removal. Finally, I mentioned off-hand the Gateway Initiative, and an apparent effort on the part of Monsanto to organize an industry group. I admitted ignorance of the details but offered that this might be a way for Monsanto to obtain "voluntary" accompaniment of other parties in removal activities. Krmcha seemed interested in following up on this idea. I made it clear that I was not speaking for anyone involved in the Gateway initiaive effort, but that if a results could be obtained through such an effort, it would be worth pursuing and proposing to the Initiative leads.

Please inform me of your availabilty for a mid-November meeting with Monsanto.

**CC:** KLASSMAN-DEBRA, SMITH-MICHAEL